

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the two sheets of drawings of Figures 26, 27 and 28 with the enclosed two replacement sheets of formal drawings of Figures 26, 27 and 28.

REMARKS

The non-final Office Action was issued on pending claims 1-11. Claims 3, 6, 8 and 10 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9 and 11 stand rejected and claim 5 is objected to. In this Response, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9 and 11 have been amended, claim 4 has been cancelled and no claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-3 and 5-11 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9 and 11 under consideration.

Applicants invite the Examiner to call Applicants' Representative to discuss any issues with this application.

Election/Restriction

The Office Action at page 2 first correctly refers to claim 5 as being included in the elected claims. Then, the Office Action refers to claim 5 as being one of the claims withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Applicants believe this is a typographical error and claim 5 is under consideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Office Action at pages 2 and 3 includes comments on Information Disclosure Statements. An Information Disclosure Statement is included with this Response.

Priority

The Office Action at page 3 notes that Applicants' claim for foreign priority has been made; however, the certified copy of the Japanese priority document has not been filed. Applicants submit the certified copy of the priority document with this Response.

Drawings

The Office Action at page 3 objects to Figures 26, 27 and 29 of the drawings as not containing a legend such as PRIOR ART. Applicants believe the reference to Figure 29 should have been Figure 28 as there is no Figure 29 in the application. Figures 26, 27 and 28 have been amended to include the legend PRIOR ART. No other changes to the drawings are being made. The enclosed amended drawings are formal drawings.

Thus, Applicants submit the objections to the drawings have been overcome.

Specification

The title of the application has been amended from the title in the International Application. The English language translation of the specification submitted with the filing of this application already includes the amended title.

The Office Action at page 4 objects to the Abstract. The Abstract has been amended as suggested in the Office Action. Thus, Applicants submit the objection to the Abstract has been overcome.

Allowable Claims

The Office Action at page 6 objects to claim 5 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but notes claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for the notice of the allowable claim.

Claim Objections

The Office Action at page 3 objects to claims 1-11 as including reference characters which are not enclosed within parentheses. In response, claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9 and 11, the pending claims which are under consideration, have been amended to remove the reference characters. Thus, the claim objections have been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102, §103

In the Office Action at pages 4 and 5, claims 1, 2, 4, 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Heimberger (US 3,456,306). In the Office Action at page 5, claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Heimberger in view of Kato (US 5,417,249). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claim. Amended claim 1 calls for: “An end stop for a slide fastener, wherein the end stop is formed by fusing a rod-like body, which is a synthetic resin piece, attached over a coupling space surrounded by a linear fastener element row and a core thread on a rear side of coupling heads of plural fastener elements located at a terminal end of the linear fastener element row made of synthetic resin and mounted on a side edge of a fastener tape.”

Applicants submit Heimberger does not have Applicants’ rod-like body as claimed in claim 1. Referring to Applicants’ Figures 1-3 and the specification at page 10, line 12 – page 11, line 12, an end stop is formed by fusing a rod-like body (6), which is a synthetic resin piece (5), attached over a coupling space (13) surrounded by a linear fastener element row (3) and a core thread (9) on a rear side of coupling heads (10) of plural fastener elements (3) located at a terminal end of the linear fastener element row (3) made of synthetic resin and mounted on a side edge of a fastener tape (4). The reference numbers inserted into the claim text are for reference purposes to the disclosed examples of the invention, and are not intended to limit the claims. Heimberger simply does not have a rod-like body attached over a coupling space at a terminal end of a linear fastener element row. Rather, the fastener element coupling spaces of Heimberger are open. Furthermore, Heimberger does not have a rod-like body surrounded by a linear fastener element row and a core thread on a rear side of coupling heads of plural fastener elements at a terminal end of a linear fastener element row. Applicants’ claim 1 claims such structure.

As to Kato, Kato does not remedy the deficiencies of Heimberger.

Independent claim 11 has been amended similar to the amendment to claim 1.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 11 are allowable. The dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Thus, Applicants submit that the §102 and §103 rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance and request a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

EVEREST INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP

Date: December 6, 2006

BY


Michael S. Leonard, Reg. No. 37,557
P.O. Box 708
Northbrook, IL 60065
Phone: (847) 272-3400